R. K. AGARWAL

HINDU LAW

CLA
CENTRAL LAW AGENCY

PUBLISHED BY:

CENTRAL LAW AGENCY
30-D/1, MOTILAL NEHRU ROAD
ALLAHABAD-2

FIRST EDITION	:	1958
FIFTEENTH EDITION	:	1989
SIXTEENTH EDITION	:	1991
SEVENTEENTH EDITION	:	1993
EIGHTEENTH EDITION	:	1995
NINETEENTH EDITION	:	1996
TWENTIETH EDITION	:	1998
TWENTY-FIRST EDITION	:	2003
TWENTY-SECOND EDITION	:	2007
TWENTY-THIRD EDITION	:	2011
TWENTY-FOURTH EDITION	:	2013
TWENTY-FIFTH EDITION	:	2016
TWENTY-SIXTH EDITION	:	2019

ISBN : 978-81-941659-1-0

Price : Rs. 450.00

PRINTED AT :

SANGAM OFFSET
ALLAHABAD

19

RELIGIOUS AND CHARITABLE ENDOWMENTS 440—457

19

Religious And Charitable Endowments

"It is for the benefit of the worshippers that there is manifestation in images of the Supreme Being, which is bodiless, which has no attribute, which consists of pure spirit, and which is without a second."[1]

"A man should always without being tired perform with faith *ishta* (sacrifices) and *purta* (works of charity); these being made with faith and with honestly acquired wealth become inexhaustible"— Manu, 4,226.

What are endowments.—Endowments are properties set apart or dedicated by gift or devise for the worship of some particular deity or for the establishment or maintenance of a religious or charitable institution, or for the benefit of the public or some section of the public in the advancement of religion, knowledge, commerce, health, safety or any other object beneficial to mankind.[2] Hospital, Schools, Universities, alms-houses for distribution of food to *Brahmanas* or the poor, establishment of idols, etc. are instances of the religious and charitable endowments.

It has been held that there are certain acid tests to find out whether a particular disposition by a person in India is a public trust or not. In that context it is necessary to ascertain whether the purpose of the endowment is the advancement of (i) religion, (ii) knowledge, (iii) commerce, (iv) health, (v) safety and other objects beneficial to mankind.[3]

Kinds of religious endowments.—Religious endowments are of two kinds:—

1. Public endowment

2. Private endowment

1. Public endowment.—In public endowment, the dedication is for the use or benefit of the public at large or a specified class. In a public trust the beneficial interest is vested in an uncertain and fluctuating body of persons, either the public at large or some considerable portion thereof answering a particular description.

2. Private endowment.—When property is set apart for the worship of a family God, in which the public are not interested, the endowment is a private one. In a

---

1. चिन्मय स्याद्वितीयस्य निष्कलस्याशरीरिणः।
उपासकानां कार्य्यार्थं ब्रह्मणो रूपकल्पना।
2. *Commissioner of Income Tax* v. *Pemsel*, (1891) AC 531.
3. *M. Kesava Gounder* v. *D.C. Rajan*, AIR 1976 Mad 103.

private trust the beneficiaries are definite and ascertained individuals, or who within a definite time, can be definitely ascertained.[1] The mere fact that Hindu worshippers have been freely admitted to a temple does not prove that the temple is public.[2]

3. Tests for determining the nature of endowment.—Whether the religious endowment is of a private nature or of public nature has to be decided with reference to the facts proved in each case. It is difficult to lay down any test or tests which may be of universal application.[3]

The participation of the members of the public in the temple and in the daily acts of the worship or in the celebrations of festival occasions may be very important factor to consider in determining the character of the temple[4]. Their Lordships of the Supreme Court[5] declared that *haveli* (temple) at Nadiad of Shri Gokulnathji and the properties attached thereto are properties of public religious trust created by followers of Vallabh cult residing in Nadiad. The fact that public are asked to enter temple only after Goswami has finished worship, in no circumstances shows that the temple is a private one. Further, the fact that the temple had the appearance of a residential house does not in any manner militate against the contention that the temple in question is a public temple.

As regards the tests of public and private endowment of temple, it has been described by Rajasthan High Court in the following manner :

"The origin of the temple, the manner in which its affairs are managed, the nature and extent of gifts received by it, rights exercised by the devotees in regard to worship therein, the consciousness of the devotees themselves as to the character of the temple, are factors to establish whether a temple is public temple or a private temple. By far the most important thing to determine is whether the public can have access to the temple as a matter of right. A private temple is generally meant for private individuals or an ascertainable group, whereas a public temple is for the benefit of the public at large."[6]

4. Features of a private edowment.—In *the Bihar State Board of Religious Trust* v. *Rameshrey Prashad,*[7] the Patna High Court had held that presence of following features clearly leads to the conclusion that the temple with the properties was a private trust :—

(1) that the temple was constructed by the member of the family;

(2) that the provisions were made in the *Samarpanama* and *Managernama* for continuously worshipping the *deities* under the superintendence and the management of the members of the family;

(3) that the entire responsibilities for the management of the trust were placed on the members of the family and the control over the manage ent was

---

1. *Bihar State Board of Religious Trust* v. *Ramashrey Prasad Chaudhary,* 1973 BLJR 234.
2. *Gourhori* v. *Sharda,* 23 Pat 917; see also Maine's Hindu Law, P. 813
3. *Kacha Kanti Seva Samity* v. *Kach Kanti Devi,* AIR 2004 SC 608
4. *Shri Gobindramji* v. *State of Rajasthan,* AIR 1963 AC 1638.
5. *G.S. Mahalaxmi* v. *Shah Ranchhoaddas,* AIR 1970 SC 2025.
6. *Sri Ram* v. *Prabhu Dayal,* AIR 1972 Raj 180.
7. AIR 1977 Pat 272.

exclusively kept in the family. No stranger was associated with the institution;

(4) that there was no interference by the public as a matter of right.

5. Distinction between of Public endowment and Private endowment.—The Madras High Court has observed in *M. Kesava Gounder* v. *D.C. Rajan*[1] that there is a distinction though fine, between public religious endowment and private religious endowments. In the former, a conferment of benefit to the public or a decipherable class or member of the public is foreseeable. But in a private religious endowment the bounty is intended to serve the kith and kin of the author of the trust through the medium of an accepted Hindu religious endowment. A known form of private religious endowment is a grant of a family deity in which the public at large is not interested.

The Allahabad High Court has in *Smt. Sarju* v. *Ayodhya Pd.*[2] said that it is impossible to conclude on the basis of one particular characteristic that endowment is private or public. When such question arises one has to look into the entire evidence and circumstances under which it is created. If any Pujari is not appointed in the temple, it speaks of a private one. When the manager of the temple is appointed from different families, it is established that the temple is public, it cannot be private. When a member of public has a right to worship in a temple or has right of decoration, it finally speaks about its public character. The worshippers are not allowed to offer worship in a temple simply because it is not said to be public temple or public endowment where the Pandas in a family take a temple as their own property and distribute the proceeds of offerings to the deity among themselves turnwise, perform Puja and celebrate the functions, get the temple repaired and reconstructed, from time to time, and bear the burden of all expenses and lookafter its management, there the temple would be regarded as private endowment. In such cases merely by giving permission to public in general for offering puja would not convert its character and nor would it become public endowment.

The Supreme Court has delivered an important judgment in *Radha Kant Deo* v. *The Commissioner of Hindu Religious Charitables*.[3] In this case it was observed by their Lordships of the Supreme Court that the religious endowment of private nature could be conceived only in Hindu Law. It is not possible under English Law. In such an endowment the family deity is established in a temple for the welfare of the family. In such an endowment the property does not vest in the deity but vests in the beneficiary. In such temples the common man may be permitted to get an access or he may enter into the temple but such entry is not by way of right and this very fact renders it of private character.

The Court laid down the following tests for the determination of a trust as to whether it is public or private :

(1) Where the origin of endowment is not known, the question arises as to whether members of public use it by way of right.

---

1. AIR 1976 Mad 102.
2. AIR 1976 All 74.
3. AIR 1981 SC 798.

(2) The fact whether it is controlled by a group of persons or by the founder of endowment.

(3) Where the document with respect to its creation is available and it is clear from the language of deed that the control over the endowment is vested in the founder or in his family and greater part of the property of the founder is dedicated in the endowment to that temple so that it could be properly managed it would result in necessary conclusion that the endowment is private in nature.

(4) Where there is no evidence that the founder has given any clarification with respect to the fact that the members of the public would contribute any share to it, there the endowment would carry an inner proof of its being private in nature.

Subject of endowment.—A Hindu may dedicate for religious and charitable objects, all property which he can validly dispose of by gift or will. There is nothing to prevent a Hindu from dedicating the whole of his property for religious and charitable purpose. A tank can be a subject of endowment.[1]

Endowment—How created.—For the purposes of the creation of an endowment except of course when the endowment is created by will, a writing is not necessary. If the endowment is created by a will, the will must be in writing and attested by at least two witnesses if the case is governed by the Indian Succession Act. It is not necessary to create a trust for the purposes of creating an endowment. A Hindu who wishes to create an endowment in the nature of a religious and charitable institution he may do so by expressing his purpose. All that is necessary is that the religious and charitable purpose must be clearly specified and that the property intended for the endowment should be set apart and dedicated for the purpose. Thus, an entry in the account book of a firm of money-lenders showing that the firm is indebted to the temple allowed by crediting of interest does not create an endowment. Even in the case of a dedication to an idol, it is necessary to vest the property in trustees. No religious ceremony such as *Sankalpa* or *Samarpana* is necessary. A clear and unequivocal manifestation of the intention to create the endowment is sufficient to constitute dedication.

Essentials of endowment.—Essentials of a valid endowment, are as follows:—

(i) Absolute dedication.—In order to create a valid endowment, the donor must dedicate the property absolutely and in perpetuity, for the worship of a deity, or for a particular charitable purpose. The donor must divest himself of the beneficial interest in the property.

In *Devkinandan* v. *Murlidhar*,[2] the Supreme Court observed that the essentials of dedication are *Sankalapa*, (determination) *utsarga* (renunciation of ownership in the property) and *prathista* (installation). There should be a formal declaration by the settlor of his intention to dedicate the property. The owner of the property should, secondly,

---

1. *Venkata Krishna* v. *Sub-Collector*, AIR 1969 SC 563.
2. AIR 1955 SC 133.

renounce his interest in the property. If the renunciation is made for the public interest or for the use of public, it becomes a public endowment. Thirdly, there should be formal installation, if it is of temple, the installation should be of the deity. In case of creation of an endowment there is no question of acceptance of the dedication of property, whereas in case of a gift in secular sense the acceptance of the gift is necessary.

Dedication of properties to deities, may be absolute or partial. The question whether a deed of dedication of properties to deities, creates an absolute or partial dedication must be settled by a conspectus of all the provisions of the deed. Where the property is wholly dedicated to the worship of the idol without reserving any beneficial interest to the settlor, his descendants or other persons, dedication is complete; if the intention of the deed is to create a charge in favour of the deity and the residue vests in the settlor, the dedication is partial. A verbal dedication of property is enough, no writing is necessary. Where there is dedication of a property and not any bit of it is reserved for the lineal descendants the dedication would be treated as absolute. Validity of the endowment is not affected by the fact that others too have been given the right to make use of the dedicated property.[1]

(ii) Object must be definite.—The object of the gift must be a definite idol, or a definite charitable object. Gift or bequest to *dharma* is invalid for vagueness and uncertainty.[2] Similarly, bequests for such charitable or public purpose as the trustees think proper, are void for uncertainty.[3]

(iii) Property must be specific.—No endowment is valid unless some definite property is dedicated. Any uncertainty regarding the subject-matter of the bequest would be fatal to the validity of endowment.

Illustration

A, by means of a will directed that money should be spent for a specified purpose but did not mention the exact amount. Such type of bequest is invalid for uncertainty.

(iv) Settlor should be capable of creating endowment.—The settlor must be a major, of sound mind, and must not suffer from any legal disqualification. A Hindu, governed by *Mitakshara* Law, can dedicate his separate or self-acquired property, but not his interest in coparcenary.

A *karta* in joint Hindu family can make a gift *inter vivos* of small portion of joint family property for pious, religious and charitable objects.[4] In *Raghunath* v. *Govinda, karta's* alienation of joint Hindu family property providing a permanent shrine to a family idol was held valid.[5] Thus, the powers of *karta* to dedicate a small portion of joint family property for the creation of an endowment has been held to be well settled.

(v) Endowment must not be opposed to any law.—Bequests to idols and temples are not invalid for transgressing that rule which forbids the creation of perpetuities.[6] The rule against accumulations, as mentioned in the Transfer of Property Act does not apply in this case, but a colourful endowment or a transfer of property even

---

1. *Nirmala Bala* v. *Balai Chand,* AIR 1965 SC 1874
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Hemchandra* v. *Peary Lal,* 47 CWN 56 (PC).
4. *Patriam* v. *Siva Subramanya,* 16 Mad 353.
5. 8 All 76.
6. See Mayne's Hindu Law, p. 914.

to a religious or charitable endowment is void if made with the intention to delay or defeat the creditors or if it is made within two years of the insolvency of the transferor.

In *M. Appala Ramanujacharyulu* v. *Venkatawanara Suchacharyulu*,[1] the Andhra Pradesh High Court has held that mere execution of a deed of dedication without the donor intending to act upon the terms of the deed would not create a valid endowment. To constitute a valid endowment, it must be established that the donor intended to divest himself of his ownership in the property dedicated. In order to determine whether an endowment is real or nominal, the factors relevant and material are (i) whether, in fact, any endowment has been created or not, and (ii) the conduct of the parties and the surrounding circumstances where an endowment has, in fact, been created or a trust came into existence. The subsequent conduct of the parties with regard to the enjoyment of the property settled or endowed, is not very much material.

'Trusts' under English Law and Charitable Endowments.—It is to be noted that a 'trust' in the sense in which the expression is used in English law, is unknown to the Hindu system. Hindu diety found expression in gifts to idols consecrated and installed in temples or religious institutions of every kind. When the gift is directly to an idol or a temple, the endowment is complete, and the person who looks after or manages the property is only the manager or custodian of the idol or the institution. In no case is the property conveyed to or vested in him nor is he a trustee in the English sense of the term, although in view of the obligations and duties resting on him, he is answerable as a trustee in the general sense of administration. Thus, the basic concept of a religious endowment under Hindu Law differs in essential particulars from the concept of a trust known to English Law.[2]

In order to decide whether a purpose was religious or charitable according to the Hindu notions and law, both are to be viewed. Dedication for promotion of a particular game or sports cannot be held to be charitable. Similarly where some property is dedicated for the establishment of a *akhara* alone with two idols to attract wrestlers of both communities, *viz.*, Hindus and Muslims, it cannot be held to be a religious trust in favour of idols.

Complete or partial dedication.—A dedication of property for religious and charitable purposes may be complete or partial. Where the whole property is dedicated absolutely to the worship of an idol, and no beneficial interest is given to any person, a dedication is said to be *absolute* or *complete*. In such case the property is held by the idol and is inalienable except for legal necessities. A *partial or qualified* dedication is one, where only a charge or trust is created in favour of an idol and in such case, the property descends to the heirs of the settlor and is alienable in the ordinary ways subject to such trust or charge in favour of an idol.[3]

Illustration

A executes a deed by which he reserves to himself a life estate in certain property and directs that after his death the income of the property shall be paid to his daughter for

---

1. AIR 1974 A.P. 316.
2. *Zain Yar Jang* v. *Director of Endowments*, AIR 1963 SC 935; *Ram Chandra Shukla* v. *Shri Mahadeoji*, AIR 1970 SC 458
3. *Ram Chandra* v. *Sri Mahadeo Ji*, AIR 1920 S.C. 458; *M.D. Reddy* v. *Subba Rao*, AIR 1957 S.C. 797.

life and after her death it will be devoted to certain temple. The question is as to whether endowment is valid?

The case can be decided on the basis of *Govind* v. *Gomti*[1] and it may be held that the endowment in this case is valid though it is to take effect after the determination of the life estates in favour of the settlor and his daughter. An endowment is not invalid because it is to take effect after the determination of an estate for life.

In *C.I.T., West-Bengal* v. *Jagannath Jee,*[2] the Supreme Court has decided that if, on consideration of the totality of terms, on shifting the more essential from the less essential purpose, on sounding the depth of the donor's wishes to find whether his family or his deity were the primary beneficiaries, and on taking note of the language used, if the vesting is in the idol, an absolute debutter can be spelt out. So considered, if the grant is to the heirs with a charge on the income for the performance of Pujas, the opposite inference is inevitable.

Proof of dedication.—A deed of trust by itself creates no endowment of property in favour of an idol. It is necessary for the person relying upon it to show by evidence *'aliunde'* that there had been an existing endowment in favour of the idol to which the description *devottar* can be applied. To prove fact of the dedication it must be further established that the executants had intended to divest themselves of their ownership in the properties dedicated.[3]

Endowment irrevocable.—When the donor of an endowment has completely divested himself of the property dedicated, he cannot revoke trust or derive any benefits therefrom, except what has been reserved.[4]

Bequest to idol not in existence at testator's death.—A gift or bequest to an idol not in existence at the time of gift or the testator's death is not invalid. The principles barring a bequest or right in favour of an unborn person is inapplicable to an idol.[5]

Samadhi.—Building of a *samadhi* over the remains of a person and the making of provision for the purpose of worship to religious preceptor and other ceremonies to be performed annually, cannot be held to be charitable and religious purpose according to Supreme Court in *Saraswathi* v. *Rajagopal.*[6] But in a later case the Madras High Court held that where an institution came into existence through a Samadhi of a Saint, any endowment created in its favour would be valid one as in due course of time it becomes a place of religious worship and the people have an access to it as a matter of right.[7] In *Nagu* v. *Banu,*[8] the Supreme Court held that an endowment cannot be prohibited in connection with cremation of an ancestor and raising of a memorial over it for performing *shradha* ceremonies and conducting periodical worship over it.

---

1. ILR 30 All 288.
2. AIR 1977 SC 1523, see also AIR 1977 Cal 473.
3. *Mohani Dasi* v. *Paresh Nath,* AIR 1954 Orissa 198.
4. ILR 51 Alld 61.
5. *Mohar Singh* v. *Het Singh,* 32 Alld 337.
6. AIR 1953 SC 49.
7. *Ratnavelu* v. *Commr. of H.R.& C.E.,* AIR 1954 Mad 398.
8. AIR 1978 SC 1174.

Idol—A Juridical person.—When property is given absolutely for the worship of an idol, it vests in the idol itself as a juristic person. Though a Hindu idol is a juristic entity with capacity to sue and be sued, the juridical person in the idol is not the material image. It is not correct to say that the image itself develops into a legal person after it is consecrated by *Pranpratishtha* ceremony. It is also not correct to say that the Supreme being of which the idol is the symbol or image is the recipient and owner of dedicated property. The idol as embodying the spiritual purpose of donor is the juristic person recognised by law and to this juristic person, the dedicated property vests.[1] But the position of the idol is not the same as that of the minor.[2] The possession and management of the dedicated property and the right to sue in respect of it is vested in the manager, *Dharamkarta* or *Shebait*. A suit respecting the property, in which the idol is interested, is properly brought and defended in the name of idol, although *necessitate rei* the proceedings in the suit must be carried on by some person who represents the idol, usually the manager of the temple.[3] In cases of private endowment, where the charge against the manager is mismanagement and misappropriation, he is not expected to file a suit for his own removal, the suit may be filed by heirs of the founder or any person interested.[4]

Where the idol in whose favour an endowment is created is damaged or becomes disfigured, the endowment does not come to any end. In *Purna Chand* v. *Gopal Lal*[5], the court held that the endowment is not affected in any way by the disfiguring or mutilation of the idol. The idol is replaced by another one and after it is duly installed, the endowment is revived and the worship of the idol re-starts as before.

Math, Devasthanam and Dharmshala.—Apart from public or private endowments there are some other kinds of religious endowments which are very popular among the Hindus. They are *Maths, Devasthanams* and *Dharamshalas*.

Math.—Religious institutions in India may be broadly divided into two classes: Idol temples and *Maths*, Idol temples or *Devasthanams* are intended for the worship of idol, either by the general public, or by some considerable section of it. The manager of the temple or *Devasthanam* is called *Shebait*, on the other hand, *Math* connotes an abode for religious students or *Sanyasis* and diffusion of religious knowledge, and the manager or head of *Math* is called Mahant.

The basic purpose of a *Math* is to encourage and provide spiritual teaching and knowledge by maintaining a competent line of spiritual teachers, who impart religious instructions to disciples and followers of the *Math* and strengthen the doctrines of the sect or school to which *Math* subscribes.

There can be a *Sudra Math* also.[6]

The Allahabad High Court has laid down that a *Math* is an institutional sanctum presided over by a superior who combines in himself the dual offices of being the head of the religious fraternity and of the manager of the secular properties of the institution of

---

1. *Idol of Shree Radhajee* v. *State of M. P.*, 1979 MPLJ 80, relying on AIR 1967 SC 1089, 1092.
2. *Kalanka Devi Sansthan* v. *MRT Nagpur*, AIR 1970 SC 439.
3. *Ishar Ram Chandra* v. *B.L. Bank Ltd.*, AIR 1941 PC 33.
4. *Bhimsen Mahapatra* v. *Ramesh Chandra Mahapatra*, AIR 1973 Orissa 159.
5. 8 C.L.J. 369.
6. *Krishna Singh* v. *Mathura Ahir*, AIR 1980 SC 707.

the *Math*[1]. *Math* is different from any other religious endowment, although both of them come into existence as a result of dedication of some property given by some religious minded person. But the property given in *Math* with a view to propapagate some religious faith or convictions vests in *Mahant*, whereas property given to a temple vests in the very deity who is instituted in such temple. The object of *Math* is to promote any religious faith whereas the object of temple is to perpetuate the worship of any particular deity.[2]

Kinds of Maths.—*Maths* are of three kinds:—

(*i*) *Mauroosi Math.*—In this Math, the office of the *Mahant* devolves upon the disciples of the existing *Mahant*.

(*ii*) *Panchayati Math.*—In such a Math, the *Mahant* is elected by the Panchayat of *Mahants*.

(*iii*) *Hakumi.*—In such a Math, the founder reserves the power of nominating a *Mahant*.

Mahant

The property of a *Math* is held by the *Mahant* as spiritual head of the institution. Ordinarily a *Mahant* should be *Sanyasi* and must observe celibacy. But there are certain *Maths* where marriage is also allowed. A female can also be a *Mahant* but she can perform only secular duties, and not spiritual or religious duties.

Rights and duties of the Mahant.—A Mahant, as a superior of a Math, has, in addition to his duties, a personal interest of a beneficial character which is much larger than that of a Shebait in debutter property.[3] *Mahant* acts in two distinct capacities (i) religious, and (ii) administrative. He is spiritual head of the endowment, the *Shebait* of the deity. He is also the manager of the properties and temporal affairs. The *Mahant* is the head of the institution. He sits upon the *Gaddi*, he initiaties candidates into the mysteries of the cult, he superintends the worship of the idol and the accustomed spiritual rites, he manages the properties of the institution, he administers its affairs; and the whole assets are vested in him as the owner thereof in trust for the institution itself.[4] Both the elements of office and property or duties and personal interest are blended together in the conception of *shebaitship* and neither can be detached from the other.[5]

The *Mahant* has the right to enjoy the property or beneficial interest so long as he is entitled to hold this office. He has large powers of disposal over surplus income of the *Math* of which he is the *Mathadipati* and the only restriction is that he cannot spend anything out of it for his personal use unconnected with the dignity of his office.[6] Where the *Math* properties were in the hands of a trespasser and a suit was filed by *Mahant* against him and the expenses were incurred for which the *Mahant* mortgaged the *Math*

---

1. AIR 1972 All 237.
2. *Swami Harbansachari* v. *Stae of M.P.*, AIR 1981 MP 82.
3. AIR 1954 SC 282.
4. *Ram Prakash Das* v. *Anand Das*, 43 IA 73.
5. *Commissioner, H.R.E.* v. *L.T. Swamiar*, AIR 1954 SC 282.
6. *The Commissioner, Hindu Religious Endowment, Madras* v. *Sri Laxmindra of Shiv Math*, AIR 1951 SC 282.

property and subsequently sold them to defray expenses for legal necessity, it was held that the transanctions were valid.[1]

In *Mahadeo Nath* v. *Meena Devi,*[2] it has been held by the Allahabad High Court that the powers of a *Mahant* can in no case extend to alienating the assets of the *Math* for the benefit of his own dependants.

He is only the manager and custodian of the idol or the institution. The *Mahant* of an *Akhara* represents the *Akhara* and has both the right to institute a suit on its behalf and the duty to defend one brought against it.[3] In almost every case he is given the right to a part of the usufruct, the mode of enjoyment and the amount of the usufruct depending on usage and custom. In no case is the property conveyed to be vested in him, nor is he a trustee in the English sense of the term, although in a view of the obligations and duties resting on him, he is answerable as a trustee, in the general sense, for maladministration.

According to the Supreme Court in *Krishna Singh* v. *Mathura Ahir,*[4] *Math* is a kind of religious institution whose chief is *Mahant*. He is meant for promoting a particular faith, and therefore, enjoys the position of head of particular sect and hence acts as manager of the property belonging to *Math.* The entire property of *Math* is of his concern. Looking after the interests of the institution, he is bound to see that the *Math* is retained.[5]

The position of the *Mahant* is analogous to that of widow holding her husband's estate under the law as it was before the enforcement of the Hindu Succession Act.

A *Mahant's* duty is not simply to manage the temporalities of a *Math.* He is the head and superior of spiritual fraternity and the purpose of *Math* is to encourage and foster spiritual training by maintenance of a competent line of teachers who could impart religious instructions to the disciples and followers of the *Math* and try to strengthen the doctrines of the particular School or order, of which they profess to be adherents.[6]

De facto Mahant is entitled to sue for the recovery of *Math* property.[7]

Mahantship, whether heritable.—It is true that the *Mahantship* is not heritable like ordinary property, but that is because of its peculiar nature and the fact that the office is generally held by an ascetic, the ordinary rule of succession does not apply.

Devolution of Office of Mahant.—Once a *Math* has been established, succession to its headship takes place within the spiritual family according to the usages that grow up in that particular institution. In a *Math* it is the custom or practice which determines as to how a successor is appointed. Succession to the office of *Mahant* or head of *Math* is regulated by the custom of the Math, if the grantor has not laid down any rule of succession that is to be given affect to. In the absence of any grant the usage of the particular institution is to be followed. Where a *Mahant* has a right to appoint his successor, he may exercise that right by act *inter vivos* or by a will. In various

---

1. *Biram Prakash* v. *Narendra Das,* AIR 1966 SC 1011.
2. AIR 1976 All 64.
3. *Guranditta* v. *Amar Das,* AIR 1965 SC 1966.
4. *Vidya Maruthy* v. *Baluswami Aiyar,* 48 IA 302.
5. AIR 1980 SC 707.
6. AIR 1954 SC 282.
7. AIR 1972 All 273.

institutions the custom is that in order to entitle the *chela* to succeed, he must be appointed or nominated by the *Mahant* during his lifetime.[1] Neither the office of a *Mahant* nor the property of *Math* can be subject to a partition. In some cases, succession depends upon election by the disciples and followers of the *Math.* It has been held by the Supreme Court that a person who was not the *chela,* but was accepted as one, could be validly appointed as a successor. He has to be necessarily a disciple for purposes of becoming successor to the office of *Mahant.*[2] Where a *Mahant* has the power to appoint his own successor, he cannot delegate or transfer that power to any other person. A person who claims the office of *Mahant* and the *Math* property on the strength of custom or usage, must establish it affirmatively by legal evidence.

The office of *Mahant* comes to an end—

(*a*) by the death of *Mahant* ,

(*b*) by renouncing the office,

(*c*) by the creation of any disabilities,

(*d*) by living an immoral life, or

(*e*) by mismanaging the whole affairs of the *Math.*

Shebait

The manager of the temple or *Devasthan* is known by the name of *Shebait* in Northern India and *Dharmakarta* in the South. The *Shebait* is one who serves and sustains the deity whose image is installed in the shrine. *Shebaitship* in its true conception involves two ideas; the maintenance of the deity and its management; it is not a bare office, but an office together with certain rights attached to it. Though the position of *Shebait* is not similar to that in England of a trustee towards the trust property, but certain duties to be performed by him are analogous of those of trustees. In other words, a *Shebait* has only the title of a manager of a religious endowment and is as such entitled, subject to usage, to the custody of idol and its properties.[3]

A Shebait is by virtue of his office, the administrator of the property attached to the temple of which he is the Shebait. Both the elements of office and property or duties and personal interest are blended together in the conception of Shebaitship and neither can be detached from the other.[4]

About the *legal character and incidents of shebaitship,* the Supreme Court in the case of *Profulla Charan* v. *Satya Charan,*[5] observed that the property dedicated to an idol vests in it in an ideal sense only; *ex-necessities,* the possession and management has to be entrusted to some human agent, called *shebait* in the North. The legal character of a *shebait* cannot be defined with precision and exactitude. Broadly described, he is the human ministrant and custodian of the idol as its earthly spokesman, its authorised representative entitled to deal with all its temporal affairs and to manage its property. As regards the administration of the debutter property his position is analogous to that of a

---

1. *Rukiminibai* v. *Nanabuwa,* 1979 Mah LJ 187 Bom.
2. *Amar Prakash* v. *Poorkashanand,* AIR 1979 SC 845.
3. (1933) 60 Cal 452 (FB).
4. *Commissioner H. R. E.* v. *L. T. Swamiar,* AIR 1954 SC 282.
5. AIR 1979 SC 1682.

trustee; yet he is not precisely in the position of a trustee in the English sense because under Hindu Law, property is absolutely dedicated to an idol, and not in the *shebait.* Although, the debutter never vests in the *shebait,* yet peculiarly enough, in about every case, the *shebait* has a right to a part of the usufruct, the mode of enjoyment and the amount of usufruct depending again on usage and custom, if not devised by the founder. As regards the service of the temple and the duties that appertain to it, he is rather in the position of the holder of an office; but even so it will not be quite correct to describe *shebaitship* as a mere office. Office and property are both present in the conception of *shebaitship.* Apart from obligations and duties resting on him in connection with the endowment the *shebait* has a personal interest in the endowed property. He has to some extent, rights of a limited owner. *Shebaitship* being property, it devolves like any other species of heritable property. It follows that where the founder does not dispose of the *shebait* rights in the endowment, the *Shebaitship* devolves on the heirs of the founder according to Hindu Law, if there is no custom or usage otherwise.[1]

Where a *shebait* declines to bring a suit or by his conduct places himself in such a position that he could not be expected to bring a suit, in order to protect the interest of deity, in the case of private endowment, the members of the family of the founder are the persons who can sue to enforce the rights of the deity.[2]

The same view was expressed by Allahabad High Court in *Sri Jhakuvji Maharaj* v. *Smt. Dankiya,*[3] where it was held that in absence of *shebait,* prospective *shebait,* having interest in property can sue on behalf of deity for drawing scheme for management of property belonging to the deity of a private trust or temple.

The possession and management of the property of religious endowment belongs to the manager, *Dharmakarta* or *Shebait* and this carries with it the right to bring whatever suits are necessary for the benefit, preservation and protection of the property of the idol. When the *Shebait* himself is the guilty person as he has been charged of making improper alienation, then the Pujari or any devotee may file a suit to protect the interest of the deity and challenge the improper alienation[4].

In *Shri Thakurji* v. *Dankiya,*[5] a person claiming to be the *defacto Shebait* filed a suit praying that a scheme of proper management of the debutter property be drawn up. It was held by Allahabad High Court that such a suit was maintainable. It is competent for the manager, *Shebait, Dharmakarta* to incur debts and borrow money for the proper expenses of keeping up the religious worship, repairing the temples, or other possessions of the idol, instituting or defending litigations, hostile attack and to prevent the endowed properties from being brought to sale in execution of decrees binding upon the institution.[6] The power, however, to incur such debts must be measured by the existing necessity for incurring them. Thus, the limit set by his power of disposition is to maintain and preserve, by proper management, the endowment or religious institution.

---

1. *Profulla Charan* v. *Satya Charan,* AIR 1979 SC 1682.
2. *Vishwakarma Mandir Trust* v. *Mt. Muni Devi,* AIR 1986 Pat 158.
3. AIR 1986 All 247.
4. *Mahajan Mahto* v. *Gopi Nath Jee,* AIR 1980 Pat 3.
5. AIR 1986 All. 247.
6. *Com. I.T.* v. *Uma Moheshware,* AIR 1969 Pat 95.

The personality of the idol may be said to be merged in that of the *Shebait*. Hence, for all legal purposes, the *Shebait* and the idol are one.[1]

The Calcutta High Court held that the *Shebaits* can carry out their duties and management of deity's properties in such order as they think proper. *Shebaitship* is an admixture of both duties and rights to property which is subject to devolution according to Hindu Law of succession. *Shebait* can appropriate part of income of deity's estate to himself.[2]

Whether Shebaitship is heritable.—It has been observed that the inheritance of *Shebaitship* descends in accordance with the ordinary rules of Hindu Law of inheritance applicable to secular property.[3]

Devolution of office of Shebait.—The office of *Shebait* is a property. It is heritable property and, therefore, subject of devolution. If in the endowment the right of devolution of *Shebaitship* has not been properly described, then in the absence of any customs or usages it devolves among the heirs of founder.[4] The devolution of the office of *Shebait* depends on the terms of the deed or will, by which it is created. Where there is no provision in the deed or will as to succession, the title to the property or the management and control of the property, as the case may be, follows the line of inheritance from the founder, in other words, it passes to his heirs, unless there has been some usage or course of dealing which points to a different mode of devolution. A *Shebait* cannot nominate his successor by will unless there be a usage justifying a nomination by will. Where the owner who has constructed a temple and installed a deity therein makes a gift of the property expressing desire that the donee should enter possession and occupation of the gifted property and perform *Sevapuja* and *rajbogh* of the deity and when there is no dedication before making the gift and it is only after the transfer the donee by his own action makes the property *devottar* constituting himself the *Shebait* of the deity, fit the deed the gift passes an interest in the donee so that his heirs would succeed to the *Shebaitship*.[5]

In *Ramji* v. *Jankiji Mauni Baba*,[6] the Patna High Court has held that it is well established that in order to succeed to the office of *Shebait*, the rule of succession existing in any monastic order among Hindus must be clearly pleaded and established. The rule of succession applicable to ordinary Hindus of the mundane world does not apply to *Shebaits*. Among them there are various modes of succession. Sometimes it is by nomination by the previous *Shebait*. Sometimes it devolves by selection amongst the *chelas* of the previous *Shebait*. Thus, it is essential that a plaintiff, in order to succeed in his case, as being a *shebait* must specifically place the order of succession on the basis of which he claims to be *Shebait*.

It has been held in *Smt. Hiranbala Devi* v. *Bhattacharya*[7] that a testator who dedicates his property to a deity by a deed of settlement cannot lay down a line of

---

1. *Sri Ram* v. *Ganeshwar Prasad*, AIR 1962 Pat 438.
2. *Jagannath Deb Roy* v. *Byomkesh Roy*, AIR 1973 Cal 1397.
3. *Buddu Jana Mahajan* v. *Shree Satpanth Sansthan*, AIR 1948 Bom 327.
4. *Prafulla Charan* v. *Satya Charan*, AIR1979 SC 1682.
5. *Shahazad Kunwar* v. *Ram Karan*, AIR 1965 SC 254.
6. AIR 1978 Pat 49.
7. AIR 1976 Cal, 404, also see *Anath Bandhu* v. *Krishna Lal*, AIR 1979 Cal 168.

succession to the office of *Shebaitship,* which is inconsistent with general law of succession.

Where a settlor appointed *A* and *B* to the office of *Shebaitship* after his death and death of his wife and added a direction that after the death *A* and *B* their male heirs according to seniority would become *Shebaits,* the direction was held to be void inasmuch as *A* and *B* were not appointed *Shebait* absolutely. They were given the right to act as *Shebaits* only for their respective lines. On the death of *A* and *B* the *Shebaitship* should revert to the house of the settlor.

Shebaiti can be transferred by will according to facts and circumstances of the case. The distinctive feature of a *Shebaiti* right is that it cannot be absolutely alienable like all other properties inasmuch as it is an office enjoining certain religious and spiritual duties to perform.[1]

Illustrations

One *M* appointed *R* and *J* as joint *Shebaits* with right of survivorship of deity Sree, Sree Gopinath Jee by an *Arpannam* on or about *Asha,* 1229, B.S. The document also directed that the *Shebait* last holding office for the time being would, before his death or relinquishment of his office as *shebait,* nominate or appoint his successor, *R,* the last *Shebait,* by her will dated 21st Oct., 1859, appointed *S* as the *Shebait* with the direction that before his death or relinquishment of office, he should appoint one of his heirs or any other person as the next *shebait. S,* by a will dated 29th March, 1910, B. S. directed that his four sons, H_1, H_2, H_3, and H_4 would be *Shebaits* in succession and laid down in line of succession-in-tail made after the death of the last survivor of the sons. H_4 died on 3rd March, 1960, but before his death, he appointed his son *K* to be next *shebait.* The plaintiff, a son H_1 instituted a suit for declaration that the appointment of *K* was invalid, and that he was the lawful *shebait* of the deity.

It was held that *S* had no right to lay down a line of succession to the office of *Shebait* contrary to that laid down by the founder of the debutter. Even assuming that he had, he was not entitled to create a line of succession which was opposed or repugnant to Hindu law. So the provision to that effect in the will of S was void. There being no independent gift (transfer) of *Shebaitship* by S in favour of the plaintiff, he was not entitled to succeed, even though he was in existence at the time of death of H_4. The appointment of H_4 as the next immediate *shebait,* being in accordance with the will of the founder was quite legal and valid, but other appointments made by him were invalid. H_4 the last legal *shebait,* not having made any appointment of his successor in accordance with the will of the founder, there was a break in the mode of devolution as laid down by the founder, the *shebaitship* would revert to the heirs of the founder, M.[2]

Dharamshala.—The management and control of *Dharamshala* generally vests in the founder and his heirs but the founder can also create some of hereditary managership, or trust through specific deed. The property dedicated to *Dharamshalas* vests in the institution itself.

Whether a female can hold the office of 'Mahantship' or 'Shebait' ?—A Hindu female is not incompetent by reason of her sex to succeed to the

---

1. *Sonabati Dass (Smt.)* v. *Kashi Nath Dey,* AIR 1927 Cal 95.
2. *Ananth Bandhu* v. *Krishna Lal Das,* AIR 1979 Cal. 168.

office of *archaka* or worshipper in a temple and to the emoluments attached thereto; for she may appoint a qualified deputy to officiate in her stead. There is nothing in the textual Hindu Law to the contrary, nor can it be said that the recognition of such usages is opposed to public policy, in the Hindu Law sense.[1]

Where the office of the *Shebait* is claimed by (i) a female (wife of the deceased), and (ii) several persons are severally entitled to it[2], the Supreme Court[3] recognised the right of female to succeed to the religious office of *Shebaitship* on the view that *Shebaitship* is a property. But while the right to such office is property it involves also substantial element of duty. In the above case it was said that both the elements of office and property, of duties and personal interests, are blended together and neither can be detached from the other. In respect of such offices specially where they are attached to public institutions, the duties are to be regarded as primary and that the rights and emoluments are only appurtenant to the duties. As the devolution of the office of the *Shebait* is regulated by succession and in absence of succession by the rule of inheritance, in both these cases woman shall be decidedly preferred in comparison, to several persons equally entitled.

Debutter property.—Property dedicated to religious uses is called 'debutter property'. "Debutter" means literally "belonging to a deity".

Alienation of debutter property.—The general rule is that property, given for religious worship and for charities connected with it, is inalienable, (either by sale or mortgage). But a *Shebait* or *Mahant* in charge of the property, in his capacity of *Shebait* or *Mahant* and as manager of the property for the purpose of keeping up the religious worship and for the benefit and preservation of the property can do so. The power of a *Shebait* or *Mahant* to alienate *debutter* property is analogous to that of a manager for infant heir. He has no power to alienate debutter property except "in a case of need or for the benefit of the estate."[4] The Allahabad High Court has affirmed the principle in *Chhedda Lal* v. *Unjiarre Lal*[5]. The Court observed that the power of alienation of a *Shebait* can be compared with the power of a manager of a minor coparcener. Generally the property dedicated to the religious and charitable purposes are inalienable but legal necessity is an exception to it. It is for the transferee to establish that the necessity was so acute that except the alienation there was no other alternative. Same rule applies with regard to permanent lease of the *debutter* property. In such case the burden lies on the alienee to prove either that there was a legal necessity or benefit of estate, or that he made proper and *bona fide* inquiries as to the existence of such necessity and did all that was reasonable to the existence of such necessity or benefit.

The Supreme Court re-affirmed the same principle when it held that where the *debutter* property is to be alienated permanently by a *Shebait* it could be permitted only in case of necessity or for the benefit of the estate.[6]

---

1. *Chandra Nath* v. *Jadavendra,* ILR 28 All 689 and *Rajeswar* v. *Gopeshwar,* ILR 35 Cal 226 (But the Bombay High Court has taken a contrary view).
2. *Raj Kali* v. *Ram Ratan,* 1955 ALJ 525 (SC).
3. *Angurbala* v. *Debobrata,* 1951 SCR 1125.
4. *Hanooman Prasad* v. *Mst. Babooee,* 61 IA 393.
5. AIR 1987 All. 127.
6. *Sridhar Suer* v. *Shri Jagannath Temple,* AIR 1970 SC 1860.

Where property is gifted in favour of temple, conditions can be imposed that the office bearers could not alienate property, but could only use income for temple purposes. Such gift is valid and alienation of property if made, is illegal. The aliences also could not perfect their title by adverse possession. Where the possession of gifted property is with the alienee, a suit by worshippers and donor's heirs seeking relief of possession for and on behalf of temple, is valid.[1]

Transfer of right of management.—A *Shebait* or *Mahant* cannot sell, lease or otherwise alienate his right of management of *debutter* property nor is the right saleable in execution of decree.[2] But an alienation by gift or will of a religious or secular office, without receiving any consideration, to a person standing in the line of succession may be valid. A gift of the right of management made to a *stranger* is not valid, unless it is sanctioned by custom. Likewise, where there are more joint *Shebaits* or *Mahants* than one they may renounce their rights in favour of one of them if the arrangement is for the benefit of the endowment.

Rights of founder.—According to Hindu Law, when the worship of an idol had been founded, the *Shebaitship* is held to be vested in the founder and his heirs, unless :

(*i*) he has disposed of it otherwise; or

(*ii*) there has been some usage or course of dealing which points to a different mode of devolution.

Apart from this founder has the following rights :

(*a*) The founder can determine the line of succession of the *Shebaitship*, provided it does not interfere with the general law of inheritance by the creation of an estate unknown or repugnant to Hindu Law.

(*b*) In case he does not make any provision, *Shebaitship* will vest in him and his heirs.

(*c*) In case the line provided by the founder fails, the *Shebaitship* reverts to him and his heirs.

(*d*) If the object of the endowment is not carried out, the founder and his heirs may sue to have the property applied to its lawful purpose, or if the trust fails for want of an object, to have the property applied *cy-pres*, that is, to other objects of a similar character.

Removal of Shebaits and Mahants.—The courts have jurisdiction to remove managers of public Hindu temples from their position and also to remove a *Shebait* of private endowment for misconduct and direct him to render accounts.

If it is found that a man in the exercise of his duties as *Shebait* and *Mahant* has put himself in a position in which the court thinks that the obligation of his office can no longer be faithfully discharged, that is sufficient ground for his removal. But a mere mistake or mere laxity of management on his part not accompanied by any

1. *Hari Singh* v. *Bishan Lal*, AIR 1992 P & H 11.
2. *Durga* v. *Chanchal*, ILR 4 All 81

fraud or dishonest misaproppriation does not, afford a ground for his removal from the office.[1]

Mismanagement and Misappropriation by Pujari or Manager.—If a manager or *Pujari* of a private trust or temple commit acts of mismanagement and misappropriation of the temple and its properties, he is not fit to remain in possession in that capacity. Thus, where *R* acting as *Pujari* or manager of a private Hindu temple, raises residential buildings of his own in the temple premises and converts them to his own use and asserts a proprietary title to them it was held that he committed acts of mismanagement and misappropriation of the temple and its properties and, therefore, he was not fit to remain in possession as *Pujari,* or manager of the temple.[2]

If a suit is filed by deity against the person in management then Section 92 of the Civil Procedure Code has no application to the suit and the sanction of the Advocate-General is not a condition of its initiation.

Doctrine of Cy-pres.—Where a clear charitable intention is expressed it will not be permitted to fail because the mode, if specified, cannot be executed, but the law will substitute another mode (*Cy-pres*), that is, as near as possible to the mode specified by the donor. The doctrine of *Cy-pres* will not apply, until it is clearly established that the mode specified by the donor cannot be carried into effect that the donor had a general charitable intention.

In *Batilal* v. *State of Maharashtra*[3] the court clearly laid down that where the object of endowment has failed or frustrated or it could not be fulfilled fully, for the remainder part or for the entire object, the court would create another endowment, but would not allow it to fail. In such cases the doctrine of *cypres* would be applied and the entire endowment property shall be diverted for the achievement of an object similar to one for which the endowment was originally conceived.

In *Jadu Gopal* v. *Pannalal,*[4] the Supreme Court has laid down that there is authority for proposition that when the property dedicated is very large, and the religious ceremonies which are expressly prescribed by the settlor, cannot exhaust entire income, some portion of the beneficial interest may be construed as undisposed of and cannot be vested as secular property in the heirs of the settlor.

Persons competent to sue.—There are several distinct rights of suit in respect of endowed property, *viz :*

1. The idol itself as a juristic person has the right of suit;
2. The *Shebait,* the human agency through whom the idol must act, has a distinct right, distinct from and, in normal case, in supersession of the idol's rights of suit and is vested in *Shebait* and not in idol;
3. The prospective *Shebaits* as persons interested in the endowment have right of suit; and

---

1. *Pearey Mohan* v. *Manohar,* 48 IA 258.
2. *Ramchand* v. *Janki Ballabhji,* AIR 1970 SC 532.
3. AIR 1954 SC 394.
4. AIR 1978 SC 1338.

4. Worshippers and members of the family of the founder have their own right.

On behalf of the idol, the *de facto* manager can also file a suit. In *Shivanand* v. *Sri Shankerji Maharaj Birajman,*[1] an Arya Samaji, who was neither a worshipper nor a *Shebait,* but was a virtual manager filed a suit. The Court held that the manager cannot be held disqualified to act as manager, because he was an Arya Samaji, who does not believe in idol worshipping. The idol installed as a god could be looked after by any person may be an Arya Samaji.

To sustain a suit with respect to endowed property the interest required may be neither direct nor measurable in money, since it will suffice, if it is such as a civil law would consider as sufficient.[2]

The Allahabad High Court, in the case of *Kishore Joo* v. *Guman Bihari Joo Deo*[3] has decided that it is settled law that normally it is the *Shebait* alone who can file a suit on behalf of the idol, but it is also equally well settled that in exceptional circumstances a person other than a *Shebait* can also institute a suit on behalf of the idol. A suit may be brought by a person who has made large donations to a private Hindu temple against a pujari.[4]

Distinction between Manager or Shebait of Idol and Trustee.— The distinction between a manager or a *Shebait* of an idol and a trustee where a trust has been created is well recognised. Legally, the properties of the trust vest in the trustee whereas in the case of an idol or a *sansthan* they do not vest in the manager or the *Shebait.* It is the deity or the *sansthan* which owns and holds the properties. It is only the possession and management which vest in the manager.[5]

---

1. AIR 1984 All 55.
2. *B. Jangi Lal* v. *Panna Lal,* 1957 All 743.
3. AIR 1978 All 1.
4. See *Kapoor Chand* v. *Ganesh Dutt,* AIR 1993 SC 1145.
5. *Kalanka Debi Sansthan* v. *M.R.T. Nagpur,* AIR 1970 SC 439.

STANDARD LAW TEXT BOOKS (ENGLISH)

Administrative Law	UPADHYAYA, J.J.R.(Dr.)
Arbitration and Conciliation Act	PARANJAPE, N.V.(Dr.)
Arbitration and Conciliation Act	MISHRA, S.S. (Dr.)
Banking Law	SRIVASTAVA, S. S. (Dr.)
Civil Procedure Code	SINGH, S.P.N.
Company Law	PARANJAPE, N.V. (Dr.)
Constitutional Law of India	PANDEY, J.N. (Dr.)
Contract Act (I)	KAPOOR, S.K. (Dr)
Contract Act (II)	KAPOOR, S.K. (Dr.)
Criminal Procedure Code	PARANJAPE, N.V. (Dr.)
Criminal Procedure Code	SAXENA, R.N.
Criminal Procedure Code	BATUK LAL
Criminology and Penology	SRIVASTAVA, S.S. (Dr.)
Easements Act	AGARAWALA, S.K.
Equity, Trusts & Fiduciary Relations	AQIL AHMAD
Equity, Trusts & Specific Relief	SINGH, G.P.
Evidence Act	BATUK LAL
Hindu Law	AGRAWAL, R.K.
Hindu Law	TRIPATHI, B.N. MANI (Dr.)
Human Rights	KAPOOR, S.K. (Dr.)
Indian Penal Code	BHATTACHARYYA, T. (Dr.)
Indian Penal Code	SRIVASTAVA, S.S. (Dr.)
Indian Penal Code	BATUK LAL
Interpretation of Statutes	BHATTACHARYYA, T. (Dr.)
International Law	KAPOOR, S.K. (Dr.)
International Law (Nut-shell)	KAPOOR, S.K. (Dr.)
Interpretation of Statutes	CHAKRAVARTY, K.P.
Insurance Law	MISHRA, M.N. (Prof.)
Jurisprudence & Legal Theory	PARANJAPE, N.V. (Dr.)
Jurisprudence & Indian Legal History	DHYANI, S.N. (Prof.)
Jurisprudence-Fundamentals	DHYANI, S.N. (Prof.)
Labour & Industrial Laws	GOSWAMI, V.G. (Dr.)
Labour Laws	CHATURVEDI, S.M.
Legal & Constitutional History	PARANJAPE, N.V. (Dr.)
Legal Writing	JAIN, R.L. (Prof.)
Limitation Act	PANDEY, D.N.R. (Dr.)
Mohammedan Law	AQIL AHMED
Partnership Act	RAY, SUKUMAR
Pleadings & Conveyancing	SRIVASTAVA, K.K. (Dr.)
Pleadings & Conveyancing	SRIVASTAVA, R.D.
Right to Information	SRIVASTAVA, S.S. (Dr.)
Right to Information	VINAY, N.PARANJAPE (Dr.)
Sale of Goods Act	SINGH, S.K. (Dr.)
Transfer of Property Act	SINHA, R.K. (Dr.)
Torts–Law of	SHUKLA, M.N.
Torts–Law of	KAPOOR, S.K. (Dr.)
Torts–Law of	PARANJAPE, N.V. (Dr.)

Central Law Agency
30 D/1, Motilal Nehru Road,
Allahabad - 211002

ISBN 81-941659-1-0
9 788194 165910